REMARKS

Entry of this Amendment in accordance under the provisions of 37 CFR §1.114, and reconsideration and allowance of this application, as amended, is respectfully requested, noting that this Amendment is filed as a Submission with a Request for Continued Examination (RCE) on even date herewith.

This Amendment is in response to the Final Office Action dated November 23, 2007. By the present Amendment, the claims have been amended in response to the 35 USC §112 rejection set forth in paragraph 4 of the Office Action. Accordingly, reconsideration and removal of the 35 USC §112, second paragraph, rejection is respectfully requested. Also, the claims have been amended to further clarify the invention, as will be discussed below. In addition, a new title has been provided, as required in the Office Action.

Reconsideration and removal of the 35 USC §102(b) rejection of the claims based on Bandy (USP 6,002,344) and the 35 USC §103(a) rejection of claims based on Bandy in view of Raimbault (USP 6,177,858) is respectfully requested. By the present Amendment, the independent claims 7 and 14 have each been amended to define an arrangement in which second information controls the timing of transmission of first information. In particular, referring, for example, to Fig. 7, this is defined as:

> "A memory which memorizes the first information and second information to control the time of transmission of the first information to the reception unit."

In addition, the independent claims 7 and 14 define an arrangement in which a memory address counter has a count value which indicates a bit address pertaining

to the first information in the memory. Still further, the independent claims 7 and 14 define an arrangement in which the IC tag sets the second information (which controls the timing for transmission of the first information) from the memory as an initial value of the counter, and then transmits the first information when the count value reaches a specific code. Since the counter controls the transmission, and since the second information determines the starting point for the counter, the second information controls the timing of the actual transmission by setting the initial point for starting the count up or down to the specific code.

Bandy fails to teach these claim limitations for several reasons. In the first place, in the Office Action, the "second information" of Bandy is information such as the manufacturers information (as recognized on page 3, line 9 et seq. of the Office Action), not information to control the timing of the transmission. This is a critical distinction of the present invention over Bandy since information, such as the manufacturer, will clearly have nothing to do with setting the time for transmission of the first information. With regard to this, as discussed in paragraph 0007 and 0068 of the published application, the present invention was developed to provide a simple way to avoid collision between information transmitted by a plurality of IC chips. By providing second in formation to control timing of the transmission of first information (which can, for example, identify the IC chip, as defined in new claims 27-30), the second information plays an important role in avoiding such collision if a plurality of IC tags are present for a single reception unit. Such an arrangement of a plurality of IC tags 41-45 operating with a single reception unit is shown, for example, in Fig. 4. As such, the present invention represents a significant improvement over prior art

arrangements seeking to avoid collision between a plurality of ID tags utilizing the same reception unit, which prior art systems are described, for example, in paragraphs 0003 through 0006 of the published application.

In addition, Bandy teaches a shift register, not a memory address counter that stores a bit address of the memory pertaining to the first information to be transmitted. Shift registers and memory address counters are well recognized as being completely different elements, as noted at www.answers.com/topic /address-counter?cat=technology. Therefore, the amended claims clearly recite a different structure than the Bandy reference by virtue of specifically defining a memory address counter, rather than a shift register.

In addition, the effect of this difference in structure is significant in the operation of the present invention as compared to the operation of Bandy. For example, in Bandy, the shift register has the same bit length as the IC tag information. In the present invention, on the other hand, the actual IC tag information can be much longer than the bit address of the location of the IC tag information. For example, if it is assumed that the memory address counter 13 has a 7-bit length, 128 addresses (2^7) can be assigned. Therefore, the identification number can have a 128-bit length which can be assigned by the 128 addresses. Thus, the bit length of the identification number 17 shown in Fig. 1, for example, can be longer than the bit length of the memory address counter. This is contrary to the arrangement of Bandy Tag ID 314 functions as a shift register, which requires that the bit length of the Tag ID 314 must be the same as the bit length of the

Counter/Shift Register 312. Therefore, reconsideration and allowance of the independent claims 7 and 14 over Bandy is respectfully requested.

Reconsideration and allowance of the dependent claims is also respectfully requested. In each case, these dependent claims define further overall combinations which are neither taught nor suggested by the primary reference to Bandy, whether considered alone or in combination with Raimbault. For example, dependent claims 12 and 21 define an arrangement in which the memory address counter and the second information to control the time of transmission of the first information have the same bit number, this is a completely different arrangement than the structure of Bandy noted on page 6, lines 1-3 of the Office Action regarding Bandy's shift register and the ID tag itself having the same bit number.

In addition, particular consideration is requested regarding new claims 25 and 26 (as well as claims 22 and 24) that define that the second information which control the transmission time is a random number. It is argued on page 6, in the second paragraph of the Office Action, that the manufacturers number or the lot number will be a random number. It is respectfully submitted that the provision of a manufacturers number or a lot number does not meet the limitation that second information controlling transmission time is a random number. By virtue of the second information being a random number in the present invention, the transmission time of the first information will be randomly controlled, thereby avoiding collision with the transmission of information from other IC tags operating with the same reception unit. The manufacturers number and the lot number will not provide

such random control of transmission time. Therefore, reconsideration and allowance of these claims is also respectfully requested.

If the Examiner believes that there are any other points which may be clarified or otherwise disposed of either by telephone discussion or by personal interview, the Examiner is invited to contact Applicants' undersigned attorney at the number indicated below.

To the extent necessary, Applicants petition for an extension of time under 37 CFR 1.136. Please charge any shortage in fees due in connection with the filing of this paper, including extension of time fees, to the Antonelli, Terry, Stout & Kraus, LLP Deposit Account No. 01-2135 (Docket No. 843.45150X00), and please credit any excess fees to such deposit account.

Respectfully submitted,
ANTONELLI, TERRY, STOUT & KRAUS, LLP

/Gregory E. Montone/
Gregory E. Montone
Registration No. 28,141

GEM/dks
(703) 312-6600